arXiv:1703.02487v1 [math.AP] 7 Mar 2017

On a cross-diffusion system arising in image denosing *

Gonzalo Galiano † Julián Velasco†

Abstract

We study a generalization of a cross-diffusion problem deduced from a nonlinear complex-variable diffusion model for signal and image denoising.

We prove the existence of weak solutions of the time-independent problem with fidelity terms under mild conditions on the data problem. Then, we show that this translates on the well-posedness of a quasi-steady state approximation of the evolution problem, and also prove the existence of weak solutions of the latter under more restrictive hypothesis.

We finally perform some numerical simulations for image denoising, comparing the performance of the cross-diffusion model and its corresponding scalar Perona-Malik equation.
Keywords: cross-diffusion, denoising, Perona-Malik, existence of solutions, simulations.

1 Introduction

A fundamental problem in image analysis is the reconstruction of an original image from an observation, usually to perform subsequent operations on it, such as segmentation or inpainting. In this reconstruction, image denoising is the main task, involving the elimination or reduction of random phenomena -noise- which has been introduced in the image acquisition process due to a number of factors like poor lighting, magnetic perturbances, etc.

Additive white Gaussian noise is surely the most used model. In this model, we assume that the observation u_0 is the addition of a *ground truth* image, u, with a zero- mean Gaussian random variable, n. That is, $u_0 = u + n$. The problem is then how to recover u from u_0.

Of course, along the years, many different techniques have been developed to treat with this important technological problem. Just to mention a few well known approaches, we have from variational models such as the ROF model [17], to models based on neighborhoods such as the Bilateral filter [18], based on nonlocal information such as the Nonlocal Means [4], or to methods based on partial differential equations, such as anisotropic diffusion models [1], or the Perona-Malik equation [16].

The Perona-Malik equation has received much attention due to the confluence of the very good denoising performance on the discrete level, the mathematical simplicity of its formulation, and the enormous difficulties to establish the well-posedness of the mathematical problem [12].

The Perona-Malik equation reads as follows:

$$\partial_t u = \operatorname{div}\big(g\nabla u\big). \tag{1}$$

*Supported by Spanish MCI Project MTM2013-43671-P.

†Dpt. of Mathematics, Universidad de Oviedo, c/ Calvo Sotelo, 33007-Oviedo, Spain (galiano@uniovi.es, julian@uniovi.es)

Here, the function $g : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is known as the *edge detector*, which prevents or induces diffusion according to some criteria. In the most usual model, $g \equiv g(|\nabla u|)$, with g satisfying $g(0) > 0$ and $g(s) \to 0$ as $s \to \infty$. Common examples of the edge detector are

$$g(s) = \frac{1}{1 + (s/\lambda)^2}, \quad \text{and} \quad g(s) = \exp\big(-\frac{s^2}{\lambda^2}\big), \tag{2}$$

for some scaling parameter $\lambda > 0$. Thus, for large gradients (edges in the image) the diffusion is small and so the edges are preserved. On the contrary, for small gradients (almost flat regions) diffusion is allowed, contributing to the elimination of small perturbances, i.e. denoising the image. Similar results are obtained when the norm of the gradient is replaced by the absolute value of the Laplacian, that is, when considering the edge detector as $g(|\Delta u|)$.

As mentioned before, many efforts have been devoted to prove the well-possedness of the Perona-Malik equation, although many questions remain open. Other efforts have been directed to state well-posed Perona-Malik type problems. In this line, Gilboa et al. [11, 10] introduced the following complex-variable Perona-Malik type problem: Find $I : [0,T] \times \Omega \to \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t I = c\,\mathrm{div}\big(g\nabla I\big) && \text{in } Q_T = (0,T)\times\Omega,\\
&g\nabla I\cdot\nu = 0 && \text{on } \Gamma_T = (0,T)\times\partial\Omega,\\
&I(0,\cdot) = I_0 && \text{in } \Omega,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is a bounded smooth domain, $\partial\Omega$ its boundary, ν the exterior unitary normal vector, and $c = \exp(i\theta)$, for some $\theta \in (0, \pi/2)$. Introducing the decomposition of I as the sum of its real and imaginary parts, $I = u_1 + iu_2$, and expanding the above equations, we deduce the problem: Find $u_1, u_2 : [0,T] \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t u_1 - \mathrm{div}\big(g(a\nabla u_1 - b\nabla u_2)\big) = 0 && \text{in } Q_T, && (3)\\
&\partial_t u_2 - \mathrm{div}\big(g(b\nabla u_1 + a\nabla u_2)\big) = 0 && \text{in } Q_T, && (4)\\
&g\nabla u_1\cdot\nu = g\nabla u_2\cdot\nu = 0 && \text{on } \Gamma_T, && (5)\\
&u_1(0,\cdot) = \mathrm{Re}(I_0),\quad u_2(0,\cdot) = \mathrm{Im}(I_0), && \text{in } \Omega, && (6)
\end{aligned}$$

with $a = \cos\theta$, $b = \sin\theta$. In this denoising model, I_0 is identified with the initial noisy image, leading to $\mathrm{Re}(I_0) = u_0$, and $\mathrm{Im}(I_0) = 0$. Thus, the u_1 equation establishes the rules of evolution of the noisy image, so u_1 should be regarded as an image itself. The second equation may be rewriten as

$$\partial_t u_2 - a\,\mathrm{div}\big(g\nabla u_2\big) = b\,\mathrm{div}\big(g\nabla u_1\big),$$

showing that u_2 is related to some regularization of second order derivatives of u_1. This motivated Gilboa et al. to, instead of considering an edge detector of the form $g(|\Delta u_1|)$, use

$$g \equiv g(u_2).$$

The Perona-Malik equation (1) is the pure filtering problem for denoising the original image. When deduced from variational principles, this kind of equations arise as the gradient descent corresponding to the PDE problem satisifed by the minima of certain functional. In this situation, we use evolution equations of the type

$$\partial_t u - \mathrm{div}(g\nabla u) = \beta(u - u_0),$$

to approximate the *true* filtered image

$$-\operatorname{div}(g\nabla u) = \beta(u - u_0).$$

Here, the right hand side is the *fidelity term*, introduced to avoid an excessive smoothing in the denoising procedure, and $\beta > 0$ is a constant balancing diffusion and fidelity.

The corresponding extension of Gilboa's et al model (3)-(6), in its steady state version, is then: Find $u_1, u_2 : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$-\operatorname{div}\big(g(a\nabla u_1 - b\nabla u_2)\big) = \beta_1(u_{10} - u_1) \qquad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{7}$$

$$-\operatorname{div}\big(g(b\nabla u_1 + a\nabla u_2)\big) = \beta_2(u_{20} - u_2) \qquad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{8}$$

$$g\nabla u_1 \cdot \nu = g\nabla u_2 \cdot \nu = 0 \qquad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \tag{9}$$

being u_{10} the original image, and $u_{20} = 0$.

The proof of existence of solutions of problem (3)-(6) (with or without fidelity terms) and of problem (7)-(9) is somehow standard in several situations. For instance, if there exists a positive constant α such that $\alpha \le g(s) \le \alpha^{-1}$, for all $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$, then the following a priori estimate is obtained for the standard energies

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2} \Big(\int_\Omega u_i^2 + \alpha \int_D |\nabla u_i|^2 \Big) \le \int_\Omega u_{i0}^2, \tag{10}$$

where $D = Q_T$ in the time-dependent problem, and $D = \Omega$ in the steady state problem. This estimate allows then to prove the existence of solutions by standard methods. However, edge detectors should not be, a priori, bounded away from zero, and thus the above energy estimate does not hold unless $u_2 \in L^\infty$.

Another simple situation is when $b = 0$, so the cross-diffusion is eliminated from the problem. The main point here is that L^∞ estimates for $u_1,\ u_2$ are obtained by standard arguments, making then estimate (10) valid . In this line, and noticing that the cross-diffusion structure of (3)-(6) (or (7)-(9)) is an L^∞ perturbation of the corresponding linear problem ($g \equiv const.$), one can ask whether a change of unknowns may lead to a diagonal diffusion system. For a general coefficients matrix $A = (a_{ij})$, that is, assuming the following form for the diffusion terms

$$-\operatorname{div}\big(g(u_1, u_2)(a_{i1}\nabla u_1 + a_{i2}\nabla u_2)\big)$$

one finds that this change is possible if one of the conditions

1. $a_{12}a_{21} > 0$, or
2. $a_{12}a_{21} = 0$ and $a_{11} \neq a_{22}$,

is satisfied. None of these conditions is satisfied by problem (3)-(6), although the second is on the base of the proof of existence of solutions given in [15] for a simplified triangular version of the problem, already proposed by Gilboa et al. [11].

The main result in this article is the proof of existence of weak solutions of a slightly more general version of the steady state problem (7)-(9), see Theorem 1. In particular, solutions to (7)-(9) are proven to be bounded in L^∞, allowing us to establish the well-posedness of a quasi-stationary steady state approximation of the (generalized) evolution problem (3)-(6), see

Corollary 1. However, our L^∞ estimates depend on the time discretization step, τ, preventing the passing to the limit $\tau \to 0$ to get a solution of the evolution problem. In Corollary 2, we detail the steps to prove the existence of solutions of the evolution problem when one of the above conditions 1. or 2. on the coefficients matrix is satisfied. Finally, in Section 4, we perform some numerical simulations based on a finite element approximation of Gilboa's et al model (3)-(6), and compare them with the results of the usual Perona-Malik model.

Let us finally mention that cross-diffusion problems like (3)-(6) appear in many applications in physics, chemistry or biology for describing the time evolution of densities of multi-component systems. A fundamental theory for the study of strongly coupled systems was developed by Amann [2] which established, under suitable conditions, local existence of solutions, which become global if their L^∞ and Hölder norms may be controled.

Since generally no maximum principle holds for parabolic systems, the proof of L^∞ bounds is a challenging problem [13], and ad hoc techniques must be employed to deduce the existence of solutions of particular problems. A useful methodology avoiding the L^∞ bounds requirement of Amman's results was introduced in [8] and later generalized in a series of papers, see [5, 6, 7, 9, 13] and the references therein. However, this technique relies on the introduction of a Lyapunov functional needing of a particular cross-diffusion structure which is not satisifed by system (3)-(6). Thus, the proof of existence of solutions of problem (3)-(6), with the edge detector g of the type (2), remains open.

2 Main results

We consider the following problems.

Evolution problem: Given a fixed $T > 0$ and a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, find $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2)$, with $u_i : (0,T) \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, such that, for $i = 1, 2$,

$$\partial_t u_i - \operatorname{div} J_i(\mathbf{u}) = f_i(\mathbf{u}) \qquad \text{in } Q_T, \tag{11}$$

$$J_i(\mathbf{u}) \cdot \nu = 0 \qquad \text{on } \Gamma_T, \tag{12}$$

$$u_i(\cdot, 0) = u_{i0} \qquad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{13}$$

with flow and fidelity functions given by

$$J_i(\mathbf{u}) = g(\mathbf{u})\big(a_{i1}\nabla u_1 + a_{i2}\nabla u_2\big), \tag{14}$$

$$f_i(\mathbf{u}) = \beta_i(u_{i0} - u_i), \tag{15}$$

for $\mathbf{u}_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)^2$, and for some constants $\beta_i \geq 0$.

Steady state problem: The steady state corresponding to problem (11)-(13) is found by dropping the time derivative in (11). However, we shall study the following generalization: find $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2)$, with $u_i : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, such that, for $i = 1, 2$,

$$\gamma_i u_i - \operatorname{div} J_i(\mathbf{u}) = G_i \qquad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{16}$$

$$J_i(\mathbf{u}) \cdot \nu = 0 \qquad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \tag{17}$$

for some functions $G_i \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, and constants $\gamma_i > 0$. We make the following hypothesis on the data, which we shall refer to as **(H)**:

1. $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is a bounded domain with Lipschitz continuous boundary, $\partial\Omega$.
2. The constant matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ satisfies:
   - Ellipticity condition: There exists a constant $a_0 > 0$ such that
   $$\xi^T A\, \xi \geq a_0|\xi|^2 \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^m.$$
   - $a_{ii} > |a_{ji}|$ for $i, j = 1, 2$.
3. The *edge detector* $g : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, with $g(K) \subset (0, \infty)$ for all compact $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$.

Theorem 1. *Assume (H), and let $\gamma_i > 0$, and $G_i \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, for $i = 1, 2$. Then, there exists a weak solution $\mathbf{u} \in H^1(\Omega)^2 \cap L^\infty(\Omega)^2$, of the stationary problem (16)-(17).*

The next result establishes the existence of solutions of a time-discrete version of problem (11)-(13), also known as the *quasi-steady state approximation* problem.

Corollary 1. *Let $\tau > 0$, assume (H), and set $\mathbf{u}^0 = \mathbf{u}_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)^2$. Then, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a weak solution $\mathbf{u}^{n+1} = (u_1^{n+1}, u_2^{n+1})$, with $u_i^{n+1} \in H^1(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$, of the problem, for $i = 1, 2$,*

$$\frac{1}{\tau}(u_i^{n+1} - u_i^n) - \operatorname{div} J_i(\mathbf{u}^{n+1}) = f_i(\mathbf{u}^{n+1}) \qquad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{18}$$

$$J_i(\mathbf{u}^{n+1}) \cdot \nu = 0 \qquad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \tag{19}$$

Finally, from the construction in Theorem 1 , we deduce the existence of solutions of the evolution problem (11)-(15) under some parameter restrictions.

Corollary 2. *Assume (H) and suppose that one of the following conditions is satisfied:*

(i) $a_{12} = a_{21} = 0$,

(ii) $a_{12}a_{21} > 0$, *or*

(iii) $a_{12}a_{21} = 0$ *and* $a_{11} \neq a_{22}$.

Then, there exists a weak solution $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2)$ of the evolution problem (11)-(13), with, for $i = 1, 2$,

$$u_i \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega)) \cap H^1(0, T; (H^1(\Omega))') \cap L^\infty(Q_T).$$

3 Proofs

Proof of Theorem 1. We start considering the following problem: Find $\mathbf{u} : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^2$ such that, for $i = 1, 2$, and $i \neq j$,

$$\gamma_i u_i - \frac{\det(A)}{a_{jj}} \operatorname{div}\big(g(\mathbf{u})\nabla u_i\big) = G_i - \alpha_{ij}G_j + \alpha_{ij}\gamma_j u_j \qquad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{20}$$

$$g(\mathbf{u})\nabla u_i \cdot \nu = 0 \qquad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \tag{21}$$

with $\alpha_{ij} = a_{ij}/a_{jj}$. Notice that, due to assumption $(\mathrm{H})_2$,

$$\det(A) > 0, \quad a_{ii} > 0, \quad \text{and} \quad |\alpha_{ij}| < 1.$$

Step 1: Linearization. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in L^2(\Omega)^2$ be given and consider the function $g_k(s_1, s_2) = g(T_k(s_1), T_k(s_2))$, with the truncation function $T_k : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$T_k(s) = \begin{cases} -k & \text{if } s \le -k, \\ s & \text{if } -k \le s \le k, \\ k & \text{if } s \ge k. \end{cases}$$

Let $\sigma \in [0, 1]$. We set the following linear problem: Find $\mathbf{u} \in H^1(\Omega)^2$ such that for $i = 1, 2$, and $i \neq j$,

$$\gamma_i u_i - \frac{\det(A)}{a_{jj}} \operatorname{div}\big(g_k(\tilde{\mathbf{u}})\nabla u_i\big) = \sigma(G_i - \alpha_{ij}G_j) + \alpha_{ij}\gamma_j u_j \qquad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{22}$$

$$g_k(\tilde{\mathbf{u}})\nabla u_i \cdot \nu = 0 \qquad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \tag{23}$$

Since, $g_k(\mathbb{R}^2) \subset g(K)$, with $K = [-k, k] \times [-k, k]$, and by assumption $(\mathrm{H})_3$, $g(K) \subset (0, \infty)$, that is, the problem is uniformly elliptic, we may apply [14][Chapter 6, Theorem 2.1], to deduce the existence of a unique weak solution $\mathbf{u} \in H^1(\Omega)^2 \cap L^\infty(\Omega)^2$ of problem (22)-(23).

We now show that the $L^\infty(\Omega)$ bound does not depend on $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ or k. Let $[s]_+$ and $[s]_-$ denote the positive and negative parts of s, so that $s = [s]_+ - [s]_-$. Taking $[u_i]_+^p \in H^1(\Omega)$ as test function in the weak formulation of (22)-(23), and using Young's inequlity, we deduce

$$\gamma_i \|[u_i]_+\|_{p+1} \le \sigma\big(\|G_i\|_{p+1} + |\alpha_{ij}|\|G_j\|_{p+1}\big) + \gamma_j|\alpha_{ij}|\|[u_j]_+\|_{p+1}.$$

Summing for $i, j = 1, 2$, with $i \neq j$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1(1 - |\alpha_{21}|)\|[u_1]_+\|_{p+1} + \gamma_2(1 - |\alpha_{12}|)\|[u_2]_+\|_{p+1} \\ \le \sigma\big(1 + |\alpha_{21}|\big)\|G_1\|_{p+1} + \sigma\big(1 + |\alpha_{12}|\big)\|G_2\|_{p+1} \end{aligned}$$

A similar estimate holds for $[u_i]_-^{p+1}$, so we obtain, taking the limit $p \to \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1(1 - |\alpha_{21}|)\|u_1\|_\infty + \gamma_2(1 - |\alpha_{12}|)\|u_2\|_\infty \\ \le \sigma\big(1 + |\alpha_{21}|\big)\|G_1\|_\infty + \sigma\big(1 + |\alpha_{12}|\big)\|G_2\|_\infty. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Step 2: Fixed point. Consider the operator $P : L^2(\Omega)^2 \times [0, 1] \to L^2(\Omega)^2$ given by $P(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}, \sigma) = \mathbf{u}$, being $\mathbf{u}$ the solution of the linear problem (22)-(23) corresponding to $(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}, \sigma)$. We check that P satisfies the conditions of the Leray-Schauder's Fixed Point theorem, that is

1. P is continuous and compact.
2. $P(\mathbf{v}, 0) = 0$ for all $\mathbf{v} \in L^2(\Omega)^2$.
3. The fixed points of P are uniformly bounded in $L^2(\Omega)^2$.

1. Let $\mathbf{v}_n \in L^2(\Omega)$ be a sequence strongly convergent to $\mathbf{v} \in L^2(\Omega)$, and $\sigma_n \to \sigma$. Define $\mathbf{u}_n = P(\mathbf{v}_n, \sigma_n)$. Using $u_{i,n} \in H^1(\Omega)$ as a test function in the weak formulation of (22)-(23) leads to

$$\gamma_i \int_\Omega |u_{i,n}|^2 + \frac{\det(A)}{a_{jj}} \min(g(K)) \int_\Omega |\nabla u_{i,n}|^2 \leq \sigma_n \int_\Omega (|G_i| + |\alpha_{ij}||G_j|)|u_{i,n}| + |\alpha_{ij}| \int_\Omega |u_{i,n}||u_{j,n}|. \tag{25}$$

We first use Hölder's inequality to deduce, after summing for $i, j = 1, 2$, with $i \neq j$

$$\gamma_1(1 - |\alpha_{21}|)\|u_1\|_2 + \gamma_2(1 - |\alpha_{12}|)\|u_2\|_2 \leq \sigma_n\big(1 + |\alpha_{21}|\big)\|G_1\|_2 + \sigma_n\big(1 + |\alpha_{12}|\big)\|G_2\|_2,$$

and then, from (25), we also deduce that $\|\nabla u_{i,n}\|_2$ is uniformly bounded. Therefore, there exists a subsequence of $\mathbf{u}_n$ (not relabeled), and a function $\mathbf{u} \in H^1(\Omega)^2$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\nabla u_{i,n} \rightharpoonup \nabla u_i && \text{weakly in } L^2(\Omega), \\ &u_{i,n} \to u_i && \text{strongly in } L^2(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

Since, by assumption, $v_{i,n} \to v_i$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ (and a.e. in Ω, for a subsequence), and $\|g_k(v_{i,n})\|_\infty$ is uniformly bounded with respect to n, we deduce by the dominated convergence theorem that $g_k(v_{i,n}) \to g_k(v_i)$ in $L^q(\Omega)$, for all $q < \infty$. Therefore,

$$g_k(\mathbf{v}_n)\nabla u_{i,n} \rightharpoonup g_k(\mathbf{v})\nabla u_i \quad \text{weakly in } L^\gamma(\Omega)$$

for any $\gamma < 2$. But since the sequence $g_k(\mathbf{v}_n)\nabla u_{i,n}$ is bounded in $L^2(\Omega)$, we deduce that, in fact,

$$g_k(\mathbf{v}_n)\nabla u_{i,n} \rightharpoonup g_k(\mathbf{v})\nabla u_i \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(\Omega).$$

The other terms in the weak formulation of (22)-(23) (with the replacements $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{v}_n$, $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_n$, and $\sigma = \sigma_n$) pass clearly to their corresponding limits. Finally, the uniqueness of solutions of problem (22)-(23) implies that the whole sequence $\mathbf{u}_n$ converges to $\mathbf{u}$. So the continuity follows. The compactness is directly deduced from the compact embedding $H^1(\Omega) \subset L^2(\Omega)$.

2. If $\mathbf{u} = P(\mathbf{v}, 0)$ then, in particular, $\mathbf{u}$ satisfies estimate (24) with $\sigma = 0$. Thus, $\mathbf{u} = 0$ a.e. in Ω.

3. If $\mathbf{u} = S(\mathbf{u}, \sigma)$, we again use that $\mathbf{u}$ satisfies (24) with $\sigma \in [0, 1]$, to get the uniform bound of $\mathbf{u}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$.

Thus, the Leray-Schauder's fixed point theorem ensures the existence of a fixed point, $\mathbf{u}$, of $P(\mathbf{u}, 1)$, which is a solution of (20)-(21) with g replaced by g_k. But since this fixed point satisfies the $L^\infty(\Omega)$ bound (24) (with $\sigma = 1$), we deduce that for k large enough $g_k(\mathbf{u}) = g(\mathbf{u})$, and thus $\mathbf{u}$ is a solution of (20)-(21).

Step 3: Solution of the original problem (16)-(17). The weak solution, $\mathbf{u}$, of problem (20)-(21) satisfies, for all $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1 \int_\Omega u_1\varphi + \frac{\det(A)}{a_{22}} \int_\Omega g(\mathbf{u})\nabla u_1 \cdot \nabla\varphi &= \int_\Omega G_1\varphi - \alpha_{12} \int_\Omega G_2\varphi + \alpha_{12}\gamma_2 \int_\Omega u_2\varphi, \\ \gamma_2 \int_\Omega u_2\varphi + \frac{\det(A)}{a_{11}} \int_\Omega g(\mathbf{u})\nabla u_2 \cdot \nabla\varphi &= \int_\Omega G_2\varphi - \alpha_{21} \int_\Omega G_1\varphi + \alpha_{21}\gamma_1 \int_\Omega u_1\varphi. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying the first equation by $a_{11}a_{22}/\det(A)$, the second by $a_{12}a_{11}/\det(A)$ and adding the results leads to

$$\gamma_1 \int_\Omega u_1\varphi + \int_\Omega g(\mathbf{u})(a_{11}\nabla u_1 + a_{12}\nabla u_2)\cdot\nabla\varphi = \int_\Omega G_1\varphi.$$

A similar combination, also gives

$$\gamma_2 \int_\Omega u_2\varphi + \int_\Omega g(\mathbf{u})(a_{21}\nabla u_1 + a_{22}\nabla u_2)\cdot\nabla\varphi = \int_\Omega G_2\varphi,$$

so $\mathbf{u}$ is a weak solution of (16)-(17).

Proof of Corollary 1 . The proof follows easily from Theorem 1 by taking $\gamma_i = \beta_i + 1/\tau > 0$ and, recursively, $G_i = \beta_{i0}u_{i0} + u_i^n/\tau \in L^\infty(\Omega)$.

Remark 1. *In terms of γ_i and G_i of Corollary 1, the bound (24) takes the form*

$$\|u_1^{n+1}\|_\infty + \|u_2^{n+1}\|_\infty \le C_1\big(\|u_1^n\|_\infty + \|u_2^n\|_\infty\big) + C_2\big(\|u_{10}\|_\infty + \|u_{20}\|_\infty\big),$$

with $C_1 > 1$ unless $\alpha_{12} = \alpha_{21} = 0$, that is, $a_{12} = a_{21} = 0$. Thus, this bound is not useful for the evolution problem, but when the matrix A is diagonal.

Proof of Corollary 2.
Case 1: $a_{12} = a_{21} = 0$ (diagonal case). Consider the time discretization (18)-(19), for which the existence of a solution $\mathbf{u}^{n+1}$ is guaranteed by Corollary 1. In this case, a finer L^∞ estimate of each time slice may be obtained. Indeed, the L^{p+1} estimate (24) of Step 1 of the proof of Corollary 1 reduces to

$$(1+\tau\beta_i)\|u_i^{n+1}\|_{p+1} \le \|u_i^n\|_{p+1} + \tau\beta_i\|u_{10}\|_{p+1},$$

and thus we get

$$\|u_i^{n+1}\|_\infty \le \frac{1}{1+\tau\beta_i}\|u_i^n\|_\infty + \frac{\tau\beta_i}{1+\tau\beta_i}\|u_{i0}\|_\infty.$$

Solving this differences inequality, we find the required uniform L^∞ estimate for proving the convergence of time interpolators. Indeed, observe that this uniform estimate also implies a uniform estimate for $\|\nabla u_i^{n+1}\|_2$, since by assumption $g(\mathbf{u}^{n+1})$ remains bounded away from zero for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Time interpolators and passing to the limit $\tau \to 0$. This step is somehow standard, so we give an sketch. We define, for $(t,x) \in (t_n, t_{n+1}] \times \Omega$, the piecewise constant and piecewise linear interpolators

$$u_i^{(\tau)}(t,x) = u_i^{n+1}(x), \quad \tilde{u}_i^{(\tau)}(t,x) = u_i^n(x) + \frac{t-t_n}{\tau}(u_i^{n+1}(x) - u_i^n(x)).$$

Using the uniform estimates of $\|u_i^{n+1}\|_\infty$ and $\|\nabla u_i^{n+1}\|_2$, we deduce the corresponding uniform estimates for $\|u_i^{(\tau)}\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)}$, $\|\tilde{u}_i^{(\tau)}\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)}$, and for

$$\|\nabla u_i^{(\tau)}\|_{L^2(Q_T)}, \quad \|\nabla \tilde{u}_i^{(\tau)}\|_{L^2(Q_T)} \quad \|\partial_t \tilde{u}_i^{(\tau)}\|_{L^2(0,T;(H^1(\Omega))')},$$

implying the existence of $u_i \in L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega)) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ and

$$\tilde{u}_i \in L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega)) \cap H^1(0,T;(H^1(\Omega))') \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$$

such that, at least in a subsequence (not relabeled), as $\tau \to 0$,

$$u_i^{(\tau)} \to u_i \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega)), \tag{26}$$
$$u_i^{(\tau)} \to u_i \quad \text{weakly* in } L^\infty(Q_T)),$$
$$\tilde{u}_i^{(\tau)} \to \tilde{u}_i \quad \text{weakly in } H^1(0,T;(H^1(\Omega))'), \tag{27}$$
$$\tilde{u}_i^{(\tau)} \to \tilde{u}_i \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega)), \tag{28}$$
$$\tilde{u}_i^{(\tau)} \to \tilde{u}_i \quad \text{weakly* in } L^\infty(Q_T)).$$

In particular, by compactness

$$\tilde{u}_i^{(\tau)} \to \tilde{u}_i \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(Q_T).$$

Since $\tilde{u}_i^{(\tau)} - u_i^{(\tau)} = \tau(\delta t - 1)\partial_t \tilde{u}_i^{(\tau)}$, with $\delta t = t/\tau - n \in [0,1]$, we also find

$$\|\tilde{u}_i^{(\tau)} - u_i^{(\tau)}\|_{L^2(0,T;(H^1(\Omega))')} \to 0 \quad \text{as } \tau \to 0. \tag{29}$$

Hence, $u_i = \tilde{u}_i$. Finally, by interpolation, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_i^{(\tau)} - u_i\|_{L^1(0,T;L^2(\Omega))} &\le \|u_i^{(\tau)} - \tilde{u}_i^{(\tau)}\|_{L^1(0,T;L^2(\Omega))} + \|\tilde{u}_i^{(\tau)} - u_i\|_{L^1(0,T;L^2(\Omega))} \\ &\le \|u_i^{(\tau)} - \tilde{u}_i^{(\tau)}\|^{1/2}_{L^1(0,T;(H^1(\Omega))')} \|u_i^{(\tau)} - \tilde{u}_i^{(\tau)}\|^{1/2}_{L^1(0,T;H^1(\Omega))} \\ &+ \|\tilde{u}_i^{(\tau)} - u_i\|_{L^1(0,T;L^2(\Omega))} \to 0,\end{aligned}$$

as $\tau \to 0$, by (28)-(29). Thus, we deduce

$$u_i^{(\tau)} \to u_i \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(Q_T). \tag{30}$$

Considering the shift operator $\sigma_\tau u_i^{(\tau)}(t,\cdot) = u_i^n$, we rewrite the weak form of (18) as

$$\int_0^T < \partial_t \tilde{u}_i^{(\tau)}, \varphi > + \int_{Q_T} J_i(\mathbf{u}^{(\tau)}) \cdot \nabla \varphi = \int_{Q_T} f_i(\mathbf{u}^{(\tau)}),$$

for all $\varphi \in L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$, with $< \cdot,\cdot >$ denoting the duality product of $(H^1(\Omega))' \times H^1(\Omega)$. Finally, we pass to the limit using (26), (27), and (30), obtaining a weak solution of (11)-(12) (with $a_{12} = a_{21} = 0$).

Case 2: $a_{12}a_{21} > 0$, or $a_{12}a_{21} = 0$ and $a_{11} \neq a_{22}$. This case may be reduced to the diagonal case through a change of unknown. The eigenvalues of the matrix A are given by

$$\mu_{1,2} = \frac{1}{2}\Big(\operatorname{tr}(A) \pm \sqrt{\Delta}\Big), \quad \text{with } \Delta = (a_{11} - a_{22})^2 + 4a_{12}a_{21}.$$

Thus, the conditions on the coefficients imply $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$ (and positive). Therefore, A is diagonalizable through a change of basis P, that is, there exist non-singular matrices D and P, with D

diagonal, such that $A = P^{-1}DP$. Introducing the new unknown $\mathbf{v} = P\mathbf{u}$, we may write problem (11)-(15) as

$$\partial_t v_i - \mu_i \operatorname{div}\big(g(P^{-1}\mathbf{v})\nabla v_i\big) = f_i(\mathbf{v}) \qquad \text{in } Q_T = (0,T)\times\Omega, \tag{31}$$

$$g(P^{-1}\mathbf{v})\nabla v_i \cdot \nu = 0 \qquad \text{on } \Gamma_T = \partial(0,T)\times\Omega, \tag{32}$$

$$v_i(\cdot,0) = v_{i0} \qquad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{33}$$

with $\mathbf{v}_0 = P\mathbf{u}_0$, $f(\mathbf{v}) = B(\mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{v})$, and $B = \operatorname{diag}(\{\beta_1, \beta_2\})$.

Therefore, the change of unknown renders the problem to a diagonal problem similar to the studied in Case 1. We thus get a solution $\mathbf{v} \in L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega)) \cap H^1(0,T;(H^1(\Omega))') \cap L^\infty(Q_T)$ of (31)-(33). Showing that $\mathbf{u} = P^{-1}\mathbf{v}$ satisfies the original problem (11)-(13) is immediate. □

4 Numerical simulations

In this section we perform some numerical simulations of the evolution cross-diffusion model (11)-(15) applied to image denoising, as introduced in Gilboa et al. [11].

Thus, we fix the initial data as $\mathbf{u}_0 = (u_{\text{noisy}}, 0)$, with u_{noisy} the image to be denoised. The edge detector function is given by

$$g(\mathbf{u}) = g(u_2), \quad \text{with } g(s) = \exp\big(-s^2/\lambda_{cd}^2\big), \tag{34}$$

with $\lambda_{cd} > 0$, and the right hand side is taken as $f_i \equiv 0$ (pure filtering case). Finally, the diffusion coefficient matrix is taken as, for fixed $\theta \in [0, \pi/2)$,

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta & -\sin\theta \\ \sin\theta & \cos\theta \end{pmatrix}.$$

We use the open source software `deal.II` [3] to implement a time semi-implicit scheme with spatial linear-wise Finite Element discretization. For the time discretization, we take in the experiments a uniform partition of $[0,T]$ of time step τ.

For $t = t_0 = 0$, set $u_i^0 = u_{i0}$. Then, for $n \geq 1$ the problem is: Find $u_i^n \in S^h$ such that for $i = 1, 2$,

$$\tfrac{1}{\tau}\big(u_i^n - u_i^{n-1}, \chi\big)^h + \big(g(u_2^n)(a_{i1}\nabla u_1^n + a_{i2}\nabla u_2^n), \nabla\chi\big)^h = 0, \tag{35}$$

for every $\chi \in S^h$, the finite element space of piecewise $\mathbb{Q}_1$-elements. Here, $(\cdot,\cdot)^h$ stands for a discrete semi-inner product on $\mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega})$.

Since (35) is a nonlinear algebraic problem, we use a fixed point argument to approximate its solution, (u_1^n, u_2^n), at each time slice $t = t_n$, from the previous approximation u_i^{n-1}. Let $u_i^{n,0} = u_i^{n-1}$. Then, for $k \geq 1$ the problem is to find $u_i^{n,k}$ such that for $i = 1, 2$, and for all $\chi \in S^h$

$$\tfrac{1}{\tau}\big(u_i^{n,k} - u_i^{n-1}, \chi\big)^h + \big(g(u_2^{n,k-1})(a_{i1}\nabla u_1^{n,k} + a_{i2}\nabla u_2^{n,k}), \nabla\chi\big)^h = 0.$$

We use the stopping criteria

$$\max_{i=1,2} \|u_i^{n,k} - u_i^{n,k-1}\|_2 < \text{tol},$$

for values of tol chosen empirically, and set $u_i^n = u_i^{n,k}$.

Finally, let us mention that we take, for the spatial domain discretization, the natural uniform partition of the box $[0,W]\times[0,H]$, where W and H stand for the width and height (in pixels) of the given image, respectively.

4.1 Experiments

We performed two denoising experiments, one for the synthetic image *Test256*, and another for the natural image *Clock* [1]. In both cases we added to the original clean image, u_{clean}, a Gaussian white noise to produce a noisy image, u_{noisy}, with a known Signal to Noise Ratio (SNR), given as

$$\text{SNR} = \frac{\text{stdv}(u_{\text{clean}})}{\text{stdv}(u_{\text{clean}} - u_{\text{noisy}})},$$

where, *stdv* stands for *standard deviation*.

For comparison purposes, we used a semi-implicit in time finite-differences in space discretization of the Perona-Malik equation, with a similar fixed point strategy in each time step. We implemented the model in two different versions: with edge detector g applying on the absolute value of the Laplacian of the image, which is in the spirit of the Gilboa et al. cross-diffusion approach, and with the more usual and efficient version in which the edge detector applies on the norm of the gradient of the image.

The parameters of the different models are fixed as follows. In both experiments, the image size is 256×256. For the cross-diffusion model, the matrix A is given by

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0.99 & -0.1 \\ 0.1 & 0.99 \end{pmatrix},$$

corresponding to the angle $\theta = \pi/30$. The time step is fixed as $\tau = 0.01$, and the tolerance for the fixed point iteration inside each time loop is taken as $\text{tol} = 10^{-3}$.

For the approximation of the Perona-Malik equation we take a smaller time step, $\tau = 0.001$, and a more exigent fixed point convergence criterion, $\text{tol} = 10^{-12}$. In addition,

- Experiment 1. The added noise leads to a SNR = 7.
  - For the cross-diffusion model, the coefficient in the edge detector (34) is taken as $\lambda_{cd} = 0.1$, while the final time is $T = 0.5$.
  - For the Perona-Malik equation, we take $\lambda_{pm} = 10$, for both versions of the edge detector. However, the final times are taken as $T = 0.5$ for the detector based on the Laplacian, and $T = 1$, for that based on the gradient. These values give, approximately, optimal PSNR values.
- Experiment 2. The added noise leads to a SNR = 10.
  - For the cross-diffusion model, $\lambda_{cd} = 0.025$, while the final time is $T = 1$.
  - For the Perona-Malik equation, we take in the case of the Laplacian based edge detector, $\lambda_{pm} = 25$, and $T = 1$. For the gradient based edge detector, we set $\lambda_{pm} = 10$, and $T = 1.5$.

In Table 1 we show the Pick Signal to Noise Ratios (PSNR's) of the ground-truth clean images versus the denoised images obtained with these methods. Recall that

$$\text{PSNR}(u_1, u_2) = 20 \log_{10} \big(255/\|u_1 - u_2\|_2\big).$$

[1] Taken from the data base of the Signal and Image Processing Institute, University of Southern California.

Table 1: **PSNR of clean image versus denoised image**

	Noisy	CD	PM (Lap)	PM (grad)
Test256	23.295	25.913	24.585	26.259
Clock	30.527	35.549	31.042	39.140

We observe in these examples that the cross-diffusion (CD) model outperforms its corresponding Perona-Malik (PM) equation model with Laplacian based edge detector. However, the usual gradient based Perona-Malik equation gives always the best result.

In Fig. 1 we show the original synthetic image and the contours plots of the denoised images obtained with the different methods. For Laplacian based edge detectors, the denoising capabilities of the cross-diffusion model against the corresponding Perona-Malik equation is notable. In Fig. 2 we produce the same plots for the Clock image. Finally, in Fig. 3 we show a detail of the original and denoised images. Here, the better performance of the gradient based Perona-Malik equation is noticeable. But also the better behavior of the cross-diffusion model when the edge detector is based on the Laplacian of the image.

5 Conclusions

We investigated the existence of solutions of a cross-diffusion model which arises as a generalization of the image denoising model introduced by Gilboa et al.[11].

For the time-indpendent problem with fidelity terms, we showed the existence of L^∞ bounded solutions under rather general conditions on the data problem. However, the L^∞ bounds, necessary to ensure the ellipticity of the diffusion operator, are not directly translated to the corresponding evolution problem and, only under some rather restrictive conditions on the coefficients, the existence of solutions could be proved. As an intermmediate result, we showed the well-posedness of a quasi-steady state approximation of the evolution problem with the same generality on the coefficient conditions as for the time-independent problem.

Regarding the denoising capability of the model, although we did not perform an exahustive experimental study, our general conclusion is that it does not seem to be a particularly efficient method. Being clear that the cross-diffusion model outperforms the corresponding Laplacian-based Perona-Malik equation, it is also clear that the gradient-based Perona-Malik equation gives better results, not to mention state of the art methods like the Nonlocal Means or fourth order variational methods. Moreover, an important drawback of the cross-diffusion model is speed of computation.

As future work, it would be interesting to check whether other cross-diffusion models with gradient (instead of density) dependent coefficients may lead to more efficient denoising methods.

References

[1] L. Álvarez, P.L. Lions, J.M. Morel, Image selective smoothing and edge detection by nonlinear diffusion II, Siam J. Numer. Anal. 29 (1992) 845–866.

[2] H. Amann, Dynamic theory of quasilinear parabolic systems: III. Global existence, Meteorol. Z. 202 (1989) 219–50.

[3] W. Bangerth, T. Heister, L. Heltai, G. Kanschat, M. Kronbichler, M. Maier, B. Turcksin, The `deal.II` Library, Version 8.3, Arch. Numer. Software 4(100) (2016) 1–11.

[4] A. Buades, B. Coll, J.M. Morel, A review of image denoising algorithms, with a new one, Multiscale Model. Sim. 4(2) (2005) 490–530.

[5] L. Chen, A. Jüngel, Analysis of a multidimensional parabolic population model with strong cross-diffusion, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 36(1) (2004), 301–322.

[6] L. Chen, A. Jüngel, Analysis of a parabolic cross-diffusion population model without self-diffusion, J. Differ. Equ., 224 (2006), 39–59.

[7] L. Desvillettes, T. Lepoutre, A. Moussa, Entropy, Duality, and Cross Diffusion, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 46 (2014) 820–853.

[8] G. Galiano, M. L. Garzón, A. Jüngel, Semi-discretization in time and numerical convergence of solutions of a nonlinear cross-diffusion population model, Numer. Math. 93(4) (2003) 655–673.

[9] G. Galiano, V. Selgas, On a cross-diffusion segregation problem arising from a model of interacting particles, Nonlinear Anal. Real World App. 18 (2014) 34–49.

[10] G. Gilboa, N. Sochen, Y. Zeevi, Image enhancement and denoising by complex diffusion processes, IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell. 26(8) (2004) 1020–1036.

[11] G. Gilboa, Y. Zeevi, N. Sochen, Complex Difusion Processes for Image Filtering, Scale-Space and Morphology in Computer Vision, Springer, 2001, 299–307.

[12] P. Guidotti, Anisotropic Diffusions of Image Processing From Perona-Malik on. To appear in Advanced Studies in Pure Mathematics.

[13] A. Jüngel, The boundedness-by-entropy method for cross-diffusion systems, Nonlinearity 28(6) (2015) 1963–2001.

[14] O. Ladyzhenskaya, N. Uraltseva, Linear and quasilinear elliptic equations, Acad Academic Press, New York, 1968.

[15] D.A. Lorenz, K. Bredies, Y. Zeevi, Nonlinear Complex and Cross Diffusion. Unpublished report, University of Bremen, 2006.

[16] P. Perona, J. Malik, Scale-space and edge detection using anisotropic diffusion, IEEE T. Pattern Anal. 12(7) (1990) 629–639.

[17] L.I. Rudin, S. Osher, E. Fatemi, Nonlinear total variation based noise removal algorithms, Physica D 60(1) (1992) 259–268.

[18] L.P. Yaroslavsky, Digital picture processing. An introduction. Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1985.



Figure 1: Experiment 1. First row: Original Test256 image and contour plots of clean and noisy images. Second row: denoising results (contour plots) of the cross-diffusion model, the PM equation with Laplacian based edge detector, and the PM equation with Laplacian based edge detector, respectively.



Figure 2: Experiment 2. First row: Original Clock image and contour plots of clean and noisy images. Second row: denoising results (contour plots) of the cross-diffusion model, the PM equation with Laplacian based edge detector, and the PM equation with Laplacian based edge detector, respectively.



Figure 3: Experiment 2. First row: Original Clock image and detail of clean and noisy images. Second row: denoising results of the cross-diffusion model, the PM equation with Laplacian based edge detector, and the PM equation with Laplacian based edge detector, respectively.